

Response to Claim Objections

3. As it is unclear to applicant as to how the claims should be numbered in light of examiners comments in #4, p. 2; pro se applicant respectfully requests the examiners and/or PTO offices assistance in the correct numbering of the claims.

In a similar manner, applicant requests the identification of the specific spelling and/or punctuation errors concerning examiner-referenced claims 189, 196, and 233.

Applicant notes that this latest OA appears to not have a number “5” (p.2-3). Applicant requests that examiner notify applicant whether or not there is a number 5, and if so, what it is; so that applicant may properly address it.

4. Regarding #6 and #7 of p. 3 of OA, as applicant continues to maintain that all remaining claims should for the many reasons cited be allowed, no action is being taken by applicant on these items in this Response.

Invalid Subject Matter: All Claims Allowable

5. Applicant is submitting with this response a two page press release (OA Response Exhibit) which reveals that—contrary to the examiner relied on, allegedly-dated 9/28/1999 PMA press release—HelpWorks Web Edition was actually not disclosed (publicly posted) nor available until on or about the April 24th, 2001 date of applicants-supplied press release; over a year after applicants priority date.

Inasmuch as *both* alleged press releases are sourced from Business Wire via Dialog; the same exact services relied upon by examiner; there continues to be (see applicants 9/20/2006 Response) an obvious serious question of just when Web Edition was publicly disclosed.

In addition, the following applicable sections of Business Wire's Terms of Use (TOU); taken directly from the Business Wire website on 4/11/2007; alerts users to the risks and dangers of, and the inherent questionable accuracy and reliability of, its very own data:

You agree that use of the Site is entirely at your own risk. Except as specifically provided in this agreement, the site and materials on the site are provided as is, without warranties or conditions of any kind, either express or implied, including, without limitation, the implied warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, or non-infringement. Business Wire does not make any representations or warranties that the Site or materials on the Site or products and services purchased at or through the Site will meet your requirements or expectations, or that the operation of the Site will be uninterrupted, timely, secure or error-free. Some jurisdictions do not allow the exclusion of certain warranties, so some or all of the above exclusions may not apply to you.

You agree that Business Wire will not be held liable for any improper or incorrect use of the Site or the materials on the Site and assumes no responsibility for any user's activities on the Site or for the inaccuracy of any content on the Site. In no event will Business Wire be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, exemplary or consequential damages, including, without limitation, procurement of substitute goods or services, loss of use, data or profits, or business interruption, arising in any way out of the use of (or inability to use) the Site or the materials on the Site or the inaccuracy of any content on the Site, however caused, under any theory of liability. This disclaimer of liability applies to any damages or injury under any cause of action, including, without limitation, those caused by any failure of performance, error, omission, interruption, deletion, defect, delay in operation or transmission, computer virus or bug, communication line failure, theft, destruction or alteration of or unauthorized access to the Site or materials on the Site. Some jurisdictions do not allow the exclusion of liability for incidental or consequential damages, so some or all of the above exclusions or limitations may not apply to you. [underlining added]

6. Furthermore, as applicant pointed out previously in his last OA response, the USPTO office itself (trademark # 76173340) reveals that the Peter Martin Company's own stated first use in commerce of HelpWorks Web Edition wasn't until 6/30/2000; again, after applicant's priority date.
7. Therefore, given the absolute criticality of establishing and confirming unquestioned dates and content for all purported, alleged prior art; and the fact that such date and content certainty for the public disclosure of HelpWorks Web Edition is clearly and

obviously not present here; it is well settled that arguments relying on such uncertain matter are rendered moot. Accordingly, all claims should for this reason alone be allowed; with the alleged press release, because it is not a bona fide reference; not qualifying to be included in a/the *Notice of References Cited*.

Non Enabling Subject Matter: All Claims Allowable

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 which forms at least one basis for the alleged PMA press release being non-enabling subject matter:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, and concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same . . .

Thus, even if the alleged PMA press release *were* date and content accurate; which applicant contends is clearly not the case; it would *still* not be a bona fide reference/prior art/enabling disclosure, for, as is the case with the large majority if not all press releases; the information PMA supplies is clearly and obviously insufficient for the ordinarily skilled artisan to create/build and operate the instant invention without undue experimentation.

What was Web Edition's structure and structural features—specifically? How were these structural features integrated with each other; and within the system as a whole—specifically? What were its operational and functional features and how did they operate—and operate together—specifically?

The alleged PMA press release doesn't say. Indeed, only with considerable and extensive experimentation could the ordinarily skilled artisan even hope to come up with the instant invention from what this alleged press release discloses--or even would reasonably suggest—to the ordinarily skilled artisan.

Considered another way, how; by any stretch of the imagination; would the only 309 word alleged PMA be deemed by the PTO to be anywhere near sufficient to meet the enabling disclosure requirements for a patent? Could a “112” rejection on such a submission be any more obvious or unassailable—or more quickly and justifiably issued—to any applicant foolish (or misinformed) enough to submit such a “disclosure” for a supposed invention?

Given then its clear lack of detail, the alleged PMA press release is non-enabling/non-operable subject matter which does not qualify for—and therefore does not and cannot constitute—a valid reference/prior art/enabling disclosure to this art generally; and even further much less so to the instant invention (MPEP 2121.01).

The disclosure in an assertedly anticipating reference must provide an enabling disclosure of the desired subject matter; mere naming or description of the subject matter is insufficient, if it cannot be produced without undue experimentation. Elan Pharm., Inc. v. **>Mayo Found. For Med. Educ. & Research<, 346 F.3d 1051, 1054, 68 USPQ2d 1373, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2003)

Accordingly, all claims should for this reason alone be allowed.

9. Respectfully, since all of examiners rejections have for a number of reasons now (again) been rendered moot, there be no need for applicant to proceed further with this Response. Applicant does accordingly request at this time that all the remaining claims be allowed and the patent for which applicant has met all the requirements for now be issued.

10. Even if the rejections were not already moot for the reasons above, the rejections would *still* be overcome, traversed, and/or rendered moot; as follows:

USC 102/103 Claim Rejections Overcome: All Claims Allowable

11. As examiner is attempting to use and rely on an alleged press release instead of a pending or issued patent as the basis for examiners 102 rejection(s), applicant will

henceforth respond in this Response as if the intent was to rely on 102(a) as the basis as opposed to the OA stated 102(e). Applicant requests that should this not be the case, that applicant be notified of, and be allowed to respond to, such notification.

12. As they contain no accompanying explanations to the rejections as is required/customary with 103 rejections (i.e. examiner stating, “*...PMA fails to expressly disclose... .*” and “*However... .*”), applicant believes that examiner has, apparently, inadvertently designated a number of claims as being subject to alleged 103 rejections as opposed to the intended (?) alleged 102 rejections; specifically: #16, p.5 (claims 184, 206, 228, 250); #22, p.6 (claims 191, 213, 235, 257); #23, p.6-7 (claims 192, 214, 236, 258); #24, p.7 (claims 193, 215, 237, 259); #25, p.7 (claims 194, 216, 238, 260); #26, p.7 (claims 195, 217, 239, 261); #27, p.7 (claims 196, 218, 240, 262); #30, p.8 (claims 198, 220, 242, 264); and #31, p.8 (claims 199, 221, 243, 265). Applicant requests that should this not be the case, that applicant be notified of, and be allowed to respond to, such notification.

13. Regardless of whether or not examiners intention was to attempt to use USC 102, or 103, as the basis for rejections of those claims not yet being indicated as being allowed and allowable, applicant will (where applicable; *again*, i.e. applicants 09/20/2006 Response) demonstrate that each and every such remaining independent and dependent claim is neither anticipated nor obvious by alleged PMA.

Note also that the alleged PMA discloses and teaches *only* the identification and acquisition of benefits by and for humans; not for businesses, governments, educational institutions, or non-profits. As this is clearly unique, non-obvious, unsuggested, and patentably distinct over the alleged PMA, for this reason alone any and all such “non-human” independent and dependent claims of the instant invention should, respectfully, be allowed.

Note also that all dependent claims incorporate all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and add additional limitations and subject matter and thus are a

fortiori patentable. In addition, the dependent claims are themselves each also independently patentable, as will be readily appreciated in this Response.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."
Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed Cir. 1987)

14. Re: OA p.3-4, #9-10 and p.4-5, #13-15: Claims 270-272 and 181, 203, 225, and 247 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the alleged PMA for at least the following reasons:

- A. PMA discloses and/or suggests no more than *human* benefit-matching.
- B. PMA discloses and/or suggests no more than benefit matching services provided by and available from social service agencies.
- C. PMA discloses and/or suggests no more than benefits available from and provided by federal, state, and/or local governments.
- D. PMA discloses and/or suggests no more than the required use of privacy-invasive, loss of anonymity, personal identification (i.e. name, social security number, drivers license/number) of the benefit seekers.

Furthermore, even if such capabilities *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such capabilities would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, claims 225 and 247 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

15. Re: OA p.5, #16 (claims 184, 206, 228, 250): Nothing in PMA teaches, discloses, or suggests such useful and valuable storage of part or all of system users data. Neither HelpWorks nor HelpWorks Web Edition (WE) offered such capabilities. While databases—internet based and not—and their use and administration were of course

known to *those* arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such capability/ies *was not* conventional in the benefit-matching art.

Furthermore, even if such capabilities *had* been known to the benefit-matching art generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such capabilities would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, claims 228 and 250 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

16. Re: OA p.5-6, #17-18. Claims 188, 210, 232, and 254 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the alleged PMA for at least the following reasons:

- A. Since, as per #15 above, alleged PMA neither teaches nor suggests the *storage* of users data, a fortiori it cannot teach the requirement that such users *must update* their stored data as a condition of continued system use.
- B. These claims absolutely *require* data updating as a *condition* of use; at best, alleged PMA teaches and/or suggests merely that users *could* or *should* update. This is a critical, valuable, and patentably distinct difference and improvement.

Furthermore, even if such required data updating *were* known to the art generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement this capability would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 232 and 254 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

17. Re: OA p.6, #19-20. Claims 189, 211, 233, and 255 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests

income/value payment/remuneration based on at least the partial value of—or some part to all--of at least one or more of the benefits themselves. Charging for services at the time of the invention consisted merely of conventional means, i.e., by subscription, per-use, etc. Because this unique capability allows *for the benefits themselves* to act, as least in part, as the financial support mechanism for the instant invention, financial support from the benefit seekers and/or others can be reduced or eliminated. Neither of the HelpWorks systems offered, taught, or suggested such an obviously useful capability.

Furthermore, even if such payment/income generation options *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement this capability would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 233 and 255 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

18. Re: OA p.6, #21. Claims 190, 212, 234, and 256 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests the benefit providers themselves paying to have their benefits made available to the benefit seekers. Having benefit providers compensate system operator—whether paid by such providers directly and/or through third parties—flips convention on its head. Such an approach will make such benefit-providing services more easily and affordably accessed by the benefit seekers.

Furthermore, even if such payment/income options *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement this capability would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 234 and 256 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

19. Re: OA p.6, #22. Claims 191, 213, 235, and 257 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests the useful and valuable, “*keep the benefits and benefits information as current as possible*” as disclosed in the instant invention. Keeping such data as current as possible in this manner is entirely foreign to alleged PMA. While “user configurable” capability may be known to some arts in general-use sense, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement this capability *is not* conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Furthermore, even if such capabilities *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such capabilities would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 235 and 257 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

20. Re: OA p.6-7, #23. Claims 192, 214, 236, and 258 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests the completely counter-intuitive, clearly unconventional revealing/providing of benefit/benefit provider information which *does not* correspond to benefit seekers data; nor the providing of application forms, contact information, or maps. The fact that the HelpWorks system (which is *not* HelpWorks WE) is meant to be a screening and referral tool *does not* also mean that the applications forms, contact information, and a map/directions are *automatically* generated in/via the message (and *directly* delivered to the benefit seeker *without* the involvement or assistance of another, i.e. a social worker printing off and/or handing forms to the benefit seeker); as is required by these four claims.

Furthermore, even if such capabilities *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such capabilities would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 236 and 258 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

21. Re: OA p.7, #24. Claims 193, 215, 237, and 259 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests the clearly useful and valuable capability of the benefit seekers and benefit providers being able—once the benefits which correspond to the seekers data have been identified—to connect and interact *directly* via the system (i.e. over the Internet); without the involvement of non-benefits-providing intermediaries. HelpWorks; requiring such intermediaries, is a *referral* tool only in the sense that the benefit seeker is *human* referred to benefit providers. And while HelpWorks WE may not require such human involvement, alleged PMA also neither says/teaches--nor even suggests—*directly via the system* connecting seekers with providers, nor enabling interaction between seekers and providers, nor offering benefits to seekers, nor completing application forms, nor assisting in the completion of the application forms, nor transmitting the benefit approvals, nor transmitting approval acceptances, nor receiving benefits, nor utilizing benefits.

Furthermore, even if such capabilities *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such capabilities would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 237 and 259 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

22. Re: OA p.7, #25. Claims 194, 216, 238, and 260 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests the clearly useful and valuable capability of real or near real time benefit matching. No such capability/ies are disclosed in alleged PMA. The fact that HelpWorks WE was web based does not automatically insure that benefit results were instantly (or near so) available upon the submission of the seekers data. They could have been delivered (i.e. e-mailed) an hour, a day, or longer; after data submission.

Furthermore, even if such capabilities *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such capabilities would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 238 and 260 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

23. Re: OA p.7, #26. Claims 195, 217, 239, and 261 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because all these four claims include the limitation, “*via said system.*” With neither HelpWorks nor HelpWorks WE are caseworkers able to have the seekers benefit information shared with them *via the system* (i.e. via the Internet). This capability enables, for example, a benefit seeker to share the benefit match results with a relative in a different state or country (i.e. have the results concurrently displayed on their own computer or cell phone/PDA screen). There is no teaching nor suggestion nor support for such a capability in alleged PMA.

Furthermore, even if such capabilities *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such capabilities would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 239 and 261 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

24. Re: OA p.7, #27. Claims 196, 218, 240, and 262 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests such capability/ies. Additionally, the useful and valuable disclosing to entities of benefits for which they *do not* qualify for; running as it does completely counter to the purpose for which benefit matching systems exist in the first place, was obviously not known to the arts.

Furthermore, even if such capabilities *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such capabilities would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 240 and 262 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

25. Re: OA p.8, #28-29. Claims 197, 219, 241, and 263 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests such a *counter-intuitive*, yet clearly useful and valuable *benefits you wouldn't normally be made aware of* capability. The disclosing of benefits without regards to at least some of seekers data clearly runs counter to the purpose and operation of benefit matching systems; including HelpWorks and HelpWorks WE. Stating that, “*...it would have been obvious to... all users.*” ; and especially so without the requisite factual basis and support; is merely unsupported conjecture and supposition. There is no teaching or suggestion in alleged PMA for the use of a *general baseline* or some sort of *basic results available to all users.*

Furthermore, even if such capabilities *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such capabilities would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 241 and 263 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

26. Re: OA p.8, #30. Claims 198, 220, 242, and 264 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests the clearly useful and valuable benefit provider *direct submission into system* capability. Neither HelpWorks nor HelpWorks WE offered or suggested such a capability. Prior art benefit matching systems relied instead on the time-consuming human gathering of benefit information from the benefit providers; which was further then human entered into the benefit matching systems. These claims provide obviously huge time, labor, and money savings advantages over any and all previous benefit matching systems. “*User configurable*” is therefore inapplicable/moot.

Furthermore, these four claims also contain “...*and or said benefits...*” ; which is an even further useful and valuable capability; and another one which PMA neither teaches nor suggests. Actually delivering the benefits themselves (i.e. monetary transfers, [gift] certificates, coupons, vouchers, etc) to the qualified seekers *directly* through the system? Unanticipated and nonobvious indeed!

Still furthermore, even if such capabilities *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such capabilities would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Finally, note that claims 242 and 264 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

27. Re: OA p.8, #31. Claims 199, 221, 243, and 265 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests this clearly useful and valuable *third party submitter* capability. Neither HelpWorks nor HelpWorks WE offered or suggested such capability. The ability of benefit providers to have others handle their benefit submissions (and administration) for them is a clear advantage to those providers who would otherwise find it difficult to submit them themselves (i.e. with their own staff/employees). Additionally, benefit submission specialists may be able to provide additional value add services to the benefit provider industry.

Furthermore, even if such a capability *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such a capability would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 243 and 265 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

28. Re: OA p.8, #32-33. Claims 200, 222, 244, and 266 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests this clearly useful and valuable *variable benefits* capability. Neither version of HelpWorks offered such capability. Benefit systems of the time required the *completion* of an application form in order to determine benefits qualification; incomplete applications—lacking *all* the necessary information/data--could not be entered; or if able to be entered, would not produce any results.

While applicant acknowledges that many database correlation systems in other arts of the time did supply variable data output as the input varied, it's important to note that such capability was *not* used in benefit matching systems of the time; as it would have been illogical (in their viewpoint, anyway) to allow benefit seekers to submit what the system providers considered incomplete applications.

Yet; as applicant has pointed out; though counter-intuitive to the field at the time; there's actually great *unanticipated* and *nonobvious* value in being able to discover *at least some of* the benefits one qualifies for, even with what the field at the time considered to be unusable "incomplete" benefit seeker data submissions.

Furthermore, even if such a capability *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such a capability would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 244 and 266 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

29. Re: OA p.9, #34-35. Claims 201, 223, 245, and 267 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because it neither teaches nor suggests this clearly useful and valuable *phantom data* capability. Inputting inaccurate information runs completely counter to the whole purpose of benefit matching systems (of the time); which of course required completely accurate information in order to deliver accurate benefit information. Yet allowing the use of phantom data, as applicant explains in his specification, actually provides some very useful and worthwhile information to the seeker. Examiners stated "... *the best-fit option...*" cannot logically be anything *but* the actual *factual* data of a benefit seeker because *only* by the use of completely *factual* information will a seeker be able to discover any and all the benefits applicable to seeker. These four claims are not for the determination of best-fit options at all; but instead allow seekers to discover what benefits they could qualify for *if* at least some of their demographic, etc traits and characteristics were *different* than they *really* are; i.e., if they earned more—or less—income, lived in a different city, were a different marital status, etc.

Furthermore, even if such a capability *had* been known to the arts generally, note that the architecture for and procedures to implement such a capability would *still* not be conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Still furthermore, note that claims 245 and 267 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

30. Re: OA p.9, #36-38. Claims 202, 224, 246, and 268 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by alleged PMA at least because the architecture for and procedures to implement such a capability are not conventional in the breakthrough benefits-matching instant invention.

Furthermore, note that claims 246 and 268 are addressed, directed, and limited to patently distinct non-human benefit-seeking entities only; making them even for this reason alone allowable.

31. Finally, numerous additional reasons why the instant invention and its claims are not obvious include at least the following: Unexpected Results, Assumed Insolubility, Lack of Implementation, Misunderstood Alleged Reference, Solution of Long-Felt and Unsolved Need, Competitive Recognition (i.e. US Dept of Labors immensely popular GovBenefits service/system), No Convincing Reasoning.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, applicant submits that all the claims not yet allowed are themselves each also allowable.

Very respectfully submitted,



Steve Morsa
POB 1996
Thousand Oaks, CA 91358
(805) 495-5025
stevemorsa@cs.com

Certificate of Mailing: I hereby certify that I will mail via Express Mail [EQ 463612901 US] this paper to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date below:

Date: April 17th, 2007


Steve Morsa, Applicant



DIALOGSELECT

OPEN ACCESS

Session ID: 32965240

SEARCH TO TITLES

NEW SEARCH

COST

LOG OFF

HELP

Peter Martin Associates Announces Release of HelpWorks Web Edition.*Business Wire, Page: 2381, April 24 2001* ←

Business Editors, Health/Medical Writers

NOTE TO MEDIA: Logo is available in a Smart News Release(TM)

on Business Wire's Home Page at www.businesswire.com andat www.newstream.com

CHICAGO--(BW HealthWire)--April 24, 2001 ←

The premier provider of social service agency software introduces a Web version of the HelpWorks(TM) eligibility screening tool, offering broad access to information on benefits and services.

HelpWorks Web Edition(TM) targets under-enrollment of children and families for critical services such as Food Stamps, the Child Health Insurance Program (CHIP), and Energy Assistance programs.

Peter Martin Associates today announced the release of a Web-based version of the company's groundbreaking HelpWorks(TM) eligibility screening software package. HelpWorks(TM) leverages expert systems technology to simplify the assessment of people's eligibility for benefits and services. People in need can now find out what they're eligible for and apply for benefits--all without having to visit multiple offices and or fill out repetitive paper application forms.

HelpWorks(TM) stores program rules in a database, then conducts a guided, personalized interview to quickly assess eligibility. If an individual or family is found to be eligible for a given program, HelpWorks(TM) matches individuals with appropriate service providers. The program can then transmit an electronic application, streamlining the entire process of accessing services.

"We think we're on the cutting edge of a revolution in the way human services, and more broadly government services, are delivered," says Edward Hamlin, founder and CEO of Peter Martin Associates. "By storing complex eligibility rules, formulas and rate tables in a database, HelpWorks(TM) frees caseworkers to focus on providing direct service to their clients."

The State of Minnesota's Biennial State Social Services Plan recently showcased HelpWorks(TM) in Clay County as an "innovative practice." Cynthia Sillers, Coordinator of the Clay County Joint Powers Collaborative, said, "The Collaborative Partners in Clay County selected HelpWorks Web as

a technological tool to vastly improve our system for connecting people to services in a rapidly changing world. We are confident that HelpWorks Web will be an asset as we continue to address quality of life issues for children and families in this community."

HelpWorks(TM) is now a core component of New Jersey's One Ease E-Link electronic government initiative. Bill Kowalski, Director of the New Jersey One Ease E-Link Initiative, says, "One Ease E-Link (OEL) offers professionals a business-to-business portal specifically for human services, and HelpWorks is a critical component of that content. HelpWorks is easy to use, yet powerful. It offers workers results on a broad and complex range of eligibility and provider information. What's more, OEL can add and update the library of programs as needed or as policies or programs change."

HelpWorks Web Edition(TM) is targeted at professional social workers and other service providers as well as public institutions that offer information kiosks and Web connections.

HelpWorks Web Edition(TM) is available as a hosted solution and on a conventional software license basis. PMA has announced plans to offer HelpWorks(TM) as a monthly subscription service beginning in the third quarter of 2001.

About Peter Martin Associates, Inc.

Peter Martin Associates (PMA) is the premier provider of software designed for public and private social service agencies, focusing on family-centered case management, information and referral, rules-based assessment, and eligibility screening. Products are available on a broad range of platforms, from laptops to the Internet. For more information, visit <http://www.petermartin.com>.

For further information on HelpWorks Web Edition(TM), visit <http://www.helpworks.com>.

Note: A Photo is available at URL: <http://www.businesswire.com/cgi-bin/photo.cgi?pw.042401/bb3>

© 2001 Business Wire

© 2001 Gale Group

Gale Group PROMT®

© 2007 The Gale Group. All rights reserved.

Dialog® File Number 16 Accession Number 8544698